AF 73661 $

[10744/2500]

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

17 Ext(4) Bates 10/21

Applicant(s)	:	Eberhard HOLL
Serial No.	:	09/748,341
Filed	:	December 22, 2000
For	:	METHOD AND DEVICE FOR DETECTING THE COMPLETE STOP OF A VEHICLE
Examiner	:	Edward J. Pipala
Art Unit	:	3661

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

Date: 10/9/03 Reg. No. 22,490

Signature: Catherine Dunk
Richard L. Mayer

APPEAL BRIEF TRANSMITTAL

SIR:

Accompanying this Appeal Brief Transmittal is an Appeal Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(a) **in triplicate** for filing in the above-identified patent application.

Please charge the appropriate fee of $330.00, the Appeal Brief fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c), to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**. The Commissioner is also authorized, as necessary and/or appropriate, to charge any additional and appropriate fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**. Two duplicate copies of this transmittal are enclosed for that purpose.

Applicant requests a four month extension of time to respond to the Notice of Allowance mailed April 15, 2003, resetting the response date to October 15, 2003. The extension fee of $1,480.00 should be charged to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

10/17/2003 MAHMED1 00000139 110600 09748341
01 FC:1254 1480.00 DA

Dated: 10/9/03

Respectfully submitted,

By: P43,035,952

By: _____
Richard L. Mayer
(Reg. No. 22,490)

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

~~10/17/2003 MAHMED1 00000090 110600 09748341~~
~~02 FC:1254 1284.00 DA~~
~~Void date: 10/17/2003 MAHMED1~~
~~10/17/2003 MAHMED1 00000090 110600 09748341~~
~~02 FC:1254 1284.00 CR~~

[10744/2500]

18
Appeal Brief (3)
Bates 10/21

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	Examiner: Edward J. Pipala
Eberhard HOLL	
For: METHOD AND DEVICE FOR DETECTING THE COMPLETE STOP OF A VEHICLE	
Filed: December 22, 2000	Art Unit: 3661
Serial No.: 09/748,341	
Confirmation No.: 9789	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: 10/9/03 ~~Reg. No. 22,490~~

Signature: _____
~~Richard L. Mayer~~

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(a)

SIR:

In the above-identified patent application ("the present application"), Appellant mailed a Notice of Appeal on April 15, 2003 from the Final Office Action issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on November 19, 2002. In the Final Office Action, claims 1 to 36 were finally rejected.

A Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 was mailed on February 12, 2003 (and filed on February 21, 2003). An Advisory Action was mailed on March 7, 2003.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(a), this Appeal Brief is being submitted in triplicate in support of the

appeal of the final rejections of claims 1 to 36. It is respectfully submitted that the final rejections of claims 1 to 36 should be reversed for the reasons set forth below.

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Robert Bosch GmbH of Stuttgart in the Federal Republic of Germany. Robert Bosch GmbH is the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in the present application.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no interferences or other appeals related to the present application "which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal."

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 17 and 36 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,129,496 ("Sigl et al.").

Claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 35 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Sigl et al. in view of United Kingdom Published Patent Application No. 2 297 619 ("Masur").

A copy of the appealed claims is attached hereto in the Appendix.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on November 19, 2002, Appellant filed a Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, which was mailed on February 12, 2003 (and filed on February 21, 2003). No proposed amendments to the claims were presented in the Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

5. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to a method and device for detecting the complete stop of a vehicle. The complete stop of a vehicle is detected as a function of the vehicle's speed or of the speed of at least one wheel of the vehicle, as well as of a function of one quantity representing the braking force when the vehicle is braked. The quantity representing the braking force is the braking pressure, in particular for a hydraulic brake. (Specification, page 1, lines 18 to 30).

The complete stop of a vehicle is detected as a function of the vehicle's speed or of the speed of at least one wheel of the vehicle, as well as of a function of one quantity representing the braking force when the vehicle is braked. The quantity representing the braking force may be the braking pressure, in particular for a hydraulic brake. Detecting complete stop denotes detecting the complete-stop instant. However, detecting complete stop may also include detecting the complete-stop location. (Specification, page 1, line 24 to page 2, line 4).

In accordance with an example embodiment of the present invention, a vehicle's complete stop may be recognized with much greater precision than conventional methods. If, for example, shortly before complete stop, the pressure on the brake is eased in order to reduce the holding pressure, significantly increased accuracy in detecting the complete stop may be attained. This is also true when maneuvering on an incline, in which case the braking pressure may be reduced just prior to reaching the complete-stop instant to the point that the vehicle moves at a steady, very low speed. In such cases, it may be possible to detect complete stop of the vehicle with significantly improved accuracy. (Specification, page 2, lines 6 to 18).

Complete-stop detection may occur as a function of at least two speed thresholds, a first speed threshold and a second speed threshold. The second speed threshold may correspond to the speed, below which the speed of the wheel can no longer be measured using the measuring method

implemented in the vehicle. The second speed threshold may be between 1.5 km/h and 3.0 km/h. (Specification, page 2, lines 20 to 29).

Figure 1 illustrates an exemplary embodiment of a device 5 for detecting a complete stop according to the present invention. Device 5 for detecting a complete stop determines a complete-stop flag F_s as a function of a second speed threshold V_2, a transmission value G, speed v of the vehicle whose complete stop is to be detected, and of braking pressure p_B of the vehicle's brake. A speed sensor, such as a speedometer, is provided for measuring speed. A value calculated in the vehicle dynamics control may be used for the speed. A pressure sensor or a pressure monitor 2 is provided for determining braking pressure p_B. Transmission value G indicates if transmission 3 has decoupled the vehicle's engine. Speed threshold v_2 may be selected so that it essentially corresponds to the speed, below which the speed of one of the vehicle's wheels can no longer be measured, e.g., using sensory technology implemented in the vehicle. Second speed threshold v_2 is may be between 1.5 km/h and 3.0 km/h. (Specification, page 5, lines 27 to page 6, line 15).

Figure 3 illustrates the method of operation of device 5 for detecting a complete stop. Until vehicle's speed v reaches second speed threshold v_2, speed v is known. This is indicated by solid line 20. Below this second speed threshold v_2, vehicle's speed v, indicated by dotted line 21, can no longer be measured by the vehicle's speed sensor technology. However, the speed can be calculated using instant-of-complete-stop calculator 10. Complete stop calculation device 5 may be used for braking pressure p_B of up to 20 bar, e.g., up to 10 bar. On the other hand, for higher braking pressures p_B, e.g., for braking pressures p_B above 20 bar, a device 32 for detecting a complete stop, as shown is Figure 6, may be used. Laden-state calculator 30, which replaces downgrade-force calculator 9 in Figure 1, and instant-of-complete-stop calculator 31, which replaces instant-of-complete-stop calculator 10 in Figure 1, differentiate device 32 for

detecting a complete stop from device 5 for detecting a complete stop. (Specification, page 8, line 26 to page 9, line 16).

The present invention is directed to a method for detecting the complete stop of a vehicle, including: the complete stop being detected as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels. (Claim 1).

The present invention is also directed to a device for detecting the complete stop of a vehicle as a function of the vehicle's speed, including: the device for detecting a complete stop detects the complete stop of a vehicle as a function of the vehicle's speed or of the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels and as a function of a quantity, which represents the braking force when the vehicle is braked. (Claim 16).

The present invention is also directed to a method for detecting a complete stop of a vehicle, including: detecting the complete stop as a function of one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel. (Claim 17).

The present invention is also directed to a device, including: an arrangement configured to detect a complete stop of a vehicle as a function of a quantity that represents a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel. (Claim 36).

6. ISSUES

1. Whether claims 1, 17 and 36 anticipated by Sigl et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

2. Whether claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 35 are unpatentable over the combination of Sigl et al. and Masur under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

7. **GROUPING OF CLAIMS**

Group 1: Claims 1, 17 and 36 stand or fall together, as to the anticipation rejection.

Group 2: Claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 35 stand or fall together, as to the obviousness rejection.

8. **ARGUMENTS**

ISSUE 1

Claims 1, 17 and 36 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sigl et al.

Claim 1 relates to a method for detecting the complete stop of a vehicle. Claim 1 recites that the complete stop is detected as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels.

Claim 17 relates to a method for detecting a complete stop of a vehicle. Claim 17 recites that the method includes detecting the complete stop as a function of one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel.

Claim 36 relates to a device and recites that the device includes an arrangement configured to detect a complete stop of a vehicle as a function of a quantity that represents a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel.

Sigl et al. purport to relate to an automatic locking brake. Sigl et al. state that "[b]rake pressure is increased when the brake pedal is operated and the vehicle falls short of a very slow reference speed v_x, which value is variable and increases as the vehicle deceleration increases." Abstract. Sigl et al. further state that "a brake control system [is] for automatically applying a braking pressure when the vehicle speed drops below a very low speed value and the

brake pedal is operated." Col. 1, lines 5 to 8. To detect that the brake pedal is operated, Sigl et al. state that "a brake light signal (BLS) switch is coupled in via a terminal 7." Col. 2, lines 66 to 67.

The Final Office Action contends that Sigl et al. describe "an automatic locking brake system which is put into effect when it has been determined that the brake pedal is being operated (braking force) and the vehicle speed falls short of a very low vehicle reference speed." Final Office Action at p. 2. The Final Office Action contends that Sigl et al. "show[s] the two factors of braking force (the detected brake pressure increase), and at least one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels." Final Office Action at pp. 2 to 3. The contentions contained in the Final Office Action belie the disclosure of Sigl et al. In this regard, Sigl et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, determining a complete stop of a vehicle as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked. Rather, Sigl et al. state that braking pressure is applied when the vehicle speed drops below a very low speed value and the brake pedal is operated. Col. 1, lines 6 to 8. The status of a brake pedal being operated does not constitute "a function of one quantity representing **braking force** when the vehicle is braked" as recited in claim 1, does not constitute "a function of a quantity (pB), which represents **the braking force** when the vehicle is braked" as recited in claim 17, and does not constitute "a function of a quantity that represents **a braking force** when the vehicle is braked" as recited in claim 36. Sigl et al. state that a reference "value is supplied to a comparator 6 which compares the vehicle speed to a low velocity comparator value V_x and supplies a signal when $V_{veh} \leq V_x$ and, additionally, a brake light signal (BLS) switch is coupled in via a terminal 7 and the throttle is in the O-position." Col. 2, lines 63 to 68. The status that a brake pedal is being depressed based on a brake light signal (BLS) is in stark contrast to the parameter

of a quantity representing **braking force** as recited in the present claims.

Additionally, Sigl et al. state that a complete stop of a vehicle is detected on a basis of "a low reference speed value v_x at which the brakes are automatically applied is variable and dependent on the deceleration in such a way that the speed value v_x increases as the deceleration increases." Col. 1, lines 24 to 36. To detect a complete stop of a vehicle, Sigl et al. note that "[i]nstead of evaluating the vehicle speed, it is also possible to evaluate the speed V_d of the driven wheel or the speed V_{nd} of the non-driven vehicle wheel. V_{nd} replaces the speed V_{veh} which has been used so far. V_d serves to evaluate the drive slippage." Col. 2, lines 40 to 45.

admit of detecting stop as function of veh or wheel speed

Thus, Sigl et al. do not detect a complete stop as a function of, inter alia, one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked as recited in claim 1, detecting a complete stop as a function of, inter alia, one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked as recited in claim 17, or an arrangement configured to detect a complete stop of a vehicle as a function of, inter alia, a quantity that represents a braking force when the vehicle is braked as recited in claim 36. Indeed, a signal from a brake light signal (BLS) switch does not provide a quantity that represents a braking force when the vehicle is braked. Moreover, Sigl et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that a complete stop is detected based on the brake light signal (BLS) switch.

agree

It is "well settled that the burden of establishing a prima facie case of anticipation resides with the [United States] Patent and Trademark Office." Ex parte Skinner, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1788, 1788 to 1789 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986) (citing In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.

1987). Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). As more fully set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Sigl et al. do not disclose, or even suggest "[a] complete stop being detected as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels" as recited in claim 1, "detecting the complete stop as a function of one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel" as recited in claim 17, or "an arrangement configured to detect a complete stop of a vehicle as a function of a quantity that represents a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel" as recited in claim 36. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Sigl et al. do not anticipate claim 1, claim 17 or claim 36.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 17 and 36 are allowable. Appellant therefore respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 36 should be reversed.

ISSUE 2

Claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 36 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Sigl et al. and Masur.

Claims 2 to 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 16 makes reference to the limitations contained in claim 1, and claims 18 to 35 ultimately depend from claim 17 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 17. As more fully set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Sigl et al. do

not disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations of claims 1 and 17. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that Sigl et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, "[a] complete stop being detected as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels" as recited in claim 1 or "detecting the complete stop as a function of one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel" as recited in claim 17.

Masur purports to relate to a method of predicting vehicle standstill. Masur states that "[a] method of determining a time when a vehicle become stationary comprises the steps of determining a threshold speed value . . . for at least one wheel during a braking phase, detecting at least one further speed value . . . for the wheel or wheels at a plurality of successive times . . . to the attainment of a measurable minimum speed, and estimating the time point . . . for the stationary state of the vehicle by forming one or more speed gradients . . . between the speed values and by extrapolating them to the zero speed." Abstract. However, Masur does not disclose, or even suggest, that a complete stop is detected as a function of, inter alia, one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked as recited in claim 1, from which claims 2 to 15 ultimately depend, or detecting complete stop as a function of, inter alia, one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked as recited in claim 17, from which claims 18 to 35 ultimately depend.

In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish prima facie obviousness, three criteria must be satisfied. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). This teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art and not based on the application disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 U.S.P.Q. 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Third, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). The mere fact that certain references can be combined does not render obvious the resultant combination unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus claimed is, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so").

As indicated above, neither Sigl et al. nor Masur discloses, or even suggests, "[a] complete stop being detected as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels" as recited in claim 1, from which claims 2 to 15 ultimately depend and to which claim 16 refers, or "detecting the complete stop as a function of one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel" as recited in claim 17, from which claims 18 to 35 ultimately depend. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Sigl et al. and Masur does not render obvious claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 35.

As regards the motivation to make the proposed combination, the Final Office Action merely refers to alleged similarities of Sigl et al. and Masur rather than setting forth any reason why the combination might be made. In this regard, the Final Office Action states:

> In that both Sigl et al. and [Masur] teach determining when a vehicle has come to a

> complete stop, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have implemented gradient and instantaneous determination of vehicle speed of [Masur] within the context of the automatic brake locking system of Sigl et al., because both teach that automatic parking brake application must not commence until the vehicle has come to a complete stop.

Final Office Action at p. 4. Allegations of similarities of cited references do not constitute a teaching, motivation or suggestion to make the combination proposed.

It is respectfully submitted that the cases of In re Fine, supra, and In re Jones, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), make plain that the Final Office Action's generalized assertions that it would have been obvious to modify or combine the references do not properly support a § 103 rejection. It is respectfully submitted that those cases make plain that the Final Office Action reflects a subjective "obvious to try" standard, and therefore does not reflect the proper evidence to support an obviousness rejection based on the references relied upon. In particular, the Court in the case of In re Fine stated that:

> The PTO has the burden under section 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. It can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. This it has not done. . . .
>
> **Instead, the Examiner relies on hindsight in reaching his obviousness determination. . . . One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.**

In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1598 to 1600 (citations omitted; italics in original; emphasis added). Likewise, the Court in the case of In re Jones stated that:

> Before the PTO may combine the disclosures of two or more prior art references in order to

> establish *prima facie* obviousness, there must be some suggestion for doing so, found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. . . .
>
> **Conspicuously missing from this record is any evidence, other than the PTO's speculation (if it be called evidence) that one of ordinary skill . . . would have been motivated to make the modifications . . . necessary to arrive at the claimed [invention].**

In re Jones, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1943, 1944 (citations omitted; italics in original).

That is exactly the case here since it is believed and respectfully submitted that the Final Office Action offers no evidence whatsoever, but only conclusory hindsight, reconstruction and speculation, which these cases have indicated does not constitute evidence that will support a proper obviousness finding. Unsupported assertions are not evidence as to why a person having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify or combine references to provide the claimed subject matter of the claims to address the problems met thereby. Accordingly, the Office must provide proper evidence of a motivation for modifying or combining the references to provide the claimed subject matter.

More recently, the Federal Circuit in the case of In re Kotzab has made plain that even if a claim concerns a "technologically simple concept" -- which is not the case here -- there still must be some finding as to the "specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan" that would motivate a person having no knowledge of the claimed subject matter to "make the combination in the manner claimed," stating that:

> In this case, the Examiner and the Board fell into the hindsight trap. The idea of a single sensor controlling multiple valves, as opposed to multiple sensors controlling multiple valves, is a technologically simple concept. With this simple concept in mind, the Patent and Trademark Office found prior art statements

> that in the abstract appeared to suggest the claimed limitation. But, there was no finding as to the specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan that would have motivated one with no knowledge of Kotzab's invention to make the combination in the manner claimed. In light of our holding of the absence of a motivation to combine the teachings in Evans, we conclude that the Board did not make out a proper prima facie case of obviousness in rejecting [the] claims . . . under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) over Evans.

In re Kotzab, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (emphasis added). Again, it is believed that there have been no such findings.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections are not sustainable in view of the foregoing.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 35 are allowable for the above reasons. Appellant respectfully submits that the final rejection of claims 2 to 16 and 18 to 35 should be reversed.

9. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1 to 36 be reversed, and that these claims be allowed as presented.

Respectfully submitted,

By: BM 35,952

Dated: 10/9/03

By:
Richard L. Mayer
(Reg. No. 22,490)

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

APPENDIX

1. A method for detecting the complete stop of a vehicle, the complete stop being detected as a function of one quantity representing braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of the vehicle's speed and the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels.

2. The method according to Claim 1, characterized in that the complete-stop detection is also carried out as a function of at least two speed thresholds, a first speed threshold (v1) and a second speed threshold (v2).

3. The method according to Claim 2, characterized in that the second speed threshold (v2) essentially corresponds to the speed below which the vehicle's speed can no longer be measured using the measuring method implemented in the vehicle.

4. The method according to Claim 2, characterized in that the second speed threshold (v2) is between 1.5 km/h and 3.0 km/h.

5. The method according to Claim 2, characterized in that the first speed threshold (v1) is established as a function of the vehicle's driving situation.

6. The method according to Claim 2, characterized in that the first speed threshold (v1) is selected in such a way that the vehicle's engine is uncoupled.

7. The method according to claim 2, characterized in that the first speed threshold (v1) is between 3.0 km/h and 6.0 km/h, preferably between 4.0 km/h and 5.0 km/h.

8. The method according to claim 1, characterized in that an average deceleration value (a) is generated from the difference between the first speed threshold (v1) and the second speed threshold (v2), as well as from the time period (t2-t1) in which the vehicle's speed (v) has a value between the first speed threshold (v1) and the second speed threshold (v2) during braking.

9. The method according to Claim 8, characterized in that a characteristic curve between vehicle deceleration (a) and quantity (pB) representing the braking force is selected as a function of the average deceleration value (a) and average value (pB) of the quantity representing the braking force during the time period (t2-t1) in which the vehicle's speed (v) has a value between first speed threshold (v1) and second speed threshold (v2) during braking.

10. The method according to Claim 9, characterized in that while the vehicle is traveling at a speed (v) below the second speed threshold (v2), the instantaneous vehicle deceleration (aH+β pB, βpB) is determined from the quantity (Pn) representing the braking force using the selected characteristic curve, and in that at least one of the quantities, complete-stop instant of the vehicle and complete-stop location of the vehicle, is determined using instantaneous deceleration (aH+β pB, βpB).

11. The method according to claim 1, in particular when the vehicle has a hydraulic brake, characterized in that braking pressure (pB) of the brake, of a hydraulic brake in particular, is the quantity representing the braking force.

12. The method according to Claim 11, characterized in that the characteristic curve between vehicle deceleration (af) and the braking pressure (PB) for a braking pressure (pB) up to 20 bar, in particular up to 10 bar, is selected so that the inclination of the roadway on which the vehicle is braking

is an arbitrary parameter of a family of characteristics between vehicle deceleration (af) and braking pressure (PB).

13. The method according to claim 11, characterized in that for a braking pressure (pB) above 10 bar, in particular above 20 bar, the characteristic curve between vehicle deceleration (af) and braking pressure (pB) is selected in such a way that the vehicle's mass is an arbitrary parameter of a family of characteristics between vehicle deceleration (af) and braking pressure (pB).

14. The method according to claim 8, characterized in that at least one of the values

- vehicle acceleration conditional upon the inclination of the roadway on which the vehicle is braking; and
- mass of the vehicle is determined as a function of the average deceleration value (a) and of the value of the quantity (pB) representing the braking force for the time period in which the vehicle's speed has a value between first speed threshold (v1) and second speed threshold (v2) during braking.

15. The method according to Claim 14, characterized in that starting the vehicle after a complete stop occurs as a function of at least one of the values

- vehicle acceleration conditional upon the inclination of the roadway on which the vehicle is braking; and
- mass of the vehicle.

16. A device (5, 32, 47) for detecting the complete stop of a vehicle as a function of the vehicle's speed in accordance with claim 1, characterized in that the device (5, 32, 47) for detecting a complete stop detects the complete stop of a vehicle as a function of the vehicle's speed or of the speed of at least one of the vehicle's wheels and as a

function of a quantity (pB), which represents the braking force when the vehicle is braked.

17. A method for detecting a complete stop of a vehicle, comprising the step of:

detecting the complete stop as a function of one quantity representing a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel.

18. The method according to claim 17, wherein the complete stop is detected in the complete stop detecting step as a function of the one quantity representing the braking force when the vehicle is braked, as a function of the one of the vehicle speed and the speed of the at least one vehicle wheel and as a function of at least two speed thresholds.

19. The method according to claim 18, wherein the at least two speed thresholds includes a first speed threshold and a second speed threshold.

20. The method according to claim 19, wherein the second speed threshold substantially corresponds to a speed below which the vehicle speed can not be measuring in accordance with a measuring method performed by the vehicle.

21. The method according to claim 19, wherein the second speed threshold is between 1.5 km/h and 3.0 km/h.

22. The method according to claim 19, further comprising the step of establishing the first speed threshold as a function of a vehicle driving situation.

23. The method according to claim 19, further comprising the step of selecting the first speed threshold so that a vehicle engine is uncoupled.

24. The method according to claim 19, wherein the first speed threshold is between 3.0 km/h and 6.0 km/h.

25. The method according to claim 19, wherein the first speed threshold is between 4.0 km/h and 5.0 km/h.

26. The method according to claim 19, further comprising the step of generating an average deceleration value from a difference between the first speed threshold and the second speed threshold and from a time period in which the vehicle speed has a value between the first speed threshold and the second speed threshold during braking.

27. The method according to claim 26, further comprising the step of selecting a characteristic curve between a vehicle deceleration and the quantity representing the braking force as a function of the average deceleration value and an average value of the quantity representing the braking force during the time period in which the vehicle speed has a value between the first speed threshold and the second speed threshold during braking.

28. The method according to claim 27, further comprising the steps of:

determining, while the vehicle is traveling at a speed below the second speed threshold, an instantaneous vehicle deceleration from the quantity representing the braking force using the characteristic curve selected in the characteristic curve selecting step; and

determining a complete-stop instant of the vehicle and a complete-stop location of the vehicle in accordance with the instantaneous deceleration.

29. The method according to claim 17, wherein the vehicle includes a hydraulic brake, the quantity representing the braking force including a braking pressure of the brake.

30. The method according to claim 27, wherein the vehicle includes a hydraulic brake, the quantity representing the braking force including a braking pressure of the brake, the characteristic curve is selected in the characteristic curve selecting step between the vehicle deceleration and the braking pressure for a braking pressure up to 20 bar so that an inclination of a roadway on which the vehicle is braking is an arbitrary parameter of a family of characteristics between the vehicle deceleration and the braking pressure.

31. The method according to claim 27, wherein the vehicle includes a hydraulic brake, the quantity representing the braking force including a braking pressure of the brake, the characteristic curve is selected in the characteristic curve selecting step between the vehicle deceleration and the braking pressure for a braking pressure up to 10 bar so that an inclination of a roadway on which the vehicle is braking is an arbitrary parameter of a family of characteristics between the vehicle deceleration and the braking pressure.

32. The method according to claim 30, wherein, for a braking pressure above 10 bar, the characteristic curve is selected in the characteristic curve selecting step between the vehicle deceleration and the braking pressure so that a vehicle mass is an arbitrary parameter of a family of characteristics between the vehicle deceleration of the braking pressure.

33. The method according to claim 30, wherein, for a braking pressure above 20 bar, the characteristic curve is selected in the characteristic curve selecting step between the vehicle deceleration and the braking pressure so that a vehicle mass is an arbitrary parameter of a family of characteristics between the vehicle deceleration of the braking pressure.

34. The method according to claim 26, further comprising the step of determining, as a function of the average deceleration value and a value of the quantity representing the braking force of the time period in which the vehicle speed has a value between the first speed threshold and the second speed threshold during braking, at least one of vehicle acceleration conditional upon an inclination of a roadway on which the vehicle is braking and a mass of the vehicle.

35. The method according to claim 34, further comprising the step of starting the vehicle after a complete stop occurs as a function of at least one of the vehicle acceleration conditional upon the inclination of the roadway on which the vehicle is braking and the mass of the vehicle.

36. A device, comprising:

an arrangement configured to detect a complete stop of a vehicle as a function of a quantity that represents a braking force when the vehicle is braked and as a function of one of a vehicle speed and a speed of at least one vehicle wheel.